UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,862	01/08/2008	**Anders Edvard Trell**	31555-2006	5771

33721 7590 06/20/2011

TORYS LLP
79 WELLINGTON STREET WEST, SUITE 3000
BOX 270, TD CENTRE
TORONTO, ON M5K 1N2
CANADA

EXAMINER	
HOLTON, STEVEN E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/20/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/538,862	TRELL, ANDERS EDVARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	STEVEN HOLTON	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 June 2011*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,21 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18,21 and 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is made in response to applicant's request for continued examination filed on 6/9/2011. Claims 1-18, 21, and, 22 are currently pending in the application. An action follows below:

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 5, filed 6/9/2011, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive in light of the amendments to the claims. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of newly found prior art.

The Examiner notes that claims 1, 21, and, 22 recite that the claims are towards a mobile telephone or calculator; however, this statement is made in the preamble and therefore provides no particular patentable weight. The previous references of White and Olsen do not disclose mobile telephones, but Olsen does disclose replacing a wired connection with a wireless connection for communicating between the input device and the computer. The standard wireless interface for a mouse would read on the new limitations of "a short range wireless communication portion to communicate with the remote computer... the remote computer responsive to input at the device". However, in the interest of furthering prosecution the Examiner has provided Fukuda et al. (USPN: 7106357) which discloses a portable telephone that is usable as a mouse for computer input. The mouse/keyboard input device from the combination of White and Olsen

could be modified using the teachings of Fukuda to include mobile telephone functions along with the mouse input and keyboard input provided by White and Olsen. The reason to combine would be to provide further functionality and flexibility to the input device of White and Olsen to further provide the mobile telephone functions disclosed by Fukuda.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 8-11, and, 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White (USPN: 5457480) in view of Olsen et al. (USPN: 6137479), hereinafter Olsen, and in further view of Fukuda et al. (USPN: 7106357), hereinafter Fukuda.

Regarding claim 1, White discloses a device for inputting data to a computer system including "a graphical location data entry portion (Fig. 2A, element 14), including at least one click button (Fig. 2C, element 204), operative for inputting graphical location data to a computer having a graphical display (Fig. 1, elements 12 and 24; col. 4, lines 7-23)". White also discloses a data entry portion, including a plurality of keys (Fig. 2C, element 206) operative for inputting data to a computer including enactment of one or more keys (col. 4, lines 23-35).

However, White discloses a small keypad only able for input of numerical data and not alphanumerical data.

Olsen discloses an input device including a position information generating element to produce coordinate information to be input to a computer and a keyboard area capable of producing alphanumeric information (col. 5, lines 33-42). Olsen also discloses that a wired connection between the input and the computer may be replaced with a wireless connection (col. 4, lines 43-50).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of White with the teachings of Olsen. The numerical keyboard of White could be replaced with the alphanumeric keyboard of Olsen. The rationale would be to replace one type of keyboard with another keyboard with expected results. The modification would allow the mouse of White to produce alphanumeric data from the keyboard as described by Olsen.

However, neither White nor Olsen disclose that the input devices are mobile telephones or calculators.

Fukuda discloses a mobile telephone that may be used as a wireless mouse for transmitting input to a computer system (Figs. 9-11). The mobile telephone/mouse further includes a transmission system for communicating between the mouse and a computer system (Fig. 11, element 46; col. 9, lines 50-58). Fukuda discloses using a radio communication path such as IrDA, Bluetooth or radio LAN, all of these interfaces are known as short range wireless communication protocols.

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of White and Olsen with the teachings of Fukuda. The mouse/keyboard input device of White and Olsen could be modified to further include mobile telephone functionality as taught by Fukuda to produce a mobile phone having the mouse and keyboard input functionality of White and Olsen. The mobile phone transmitters and components of Fukuda would be added to the mouse/keyboard input system of White and Olsen. The rationale would have been to apply a know technique of the art with expected results. Fukuda discloses that it is known to combine a mouse and mobile telephone; therefore, it would have been obvious that the mouse/keyboard input device of White and Olsen could be modified to also include mobile telephone functions in a manner similar to Fukuda. Thus, the combination of White, Olsen, and Fukuda disclose all of the limitations of claim 1.

Regarding claim 8, neither White nor Olsen disclose software for providing audible feedback to disclose an accepted input of alphanumeric data. The Examiner takes Official Notice that computer software to produce a sound to indicated a typed letter are well known in the art and at the time of invention it would have been a matter of design choice for one of ordinary skill in the art to include software to provide a audible sound to indicate an inputted character from a key press.

Regarding claim 9, White discloses the graphical location entry portion and the keyboard portions can be separately activated or deactivated by command functions (Fig. 3 shows activation of different elements; col. 4, lines 24-36 and lines 48-63).

Regarding claim 10, Olsen discloses at least two columns and two rows of keys (Fig. 2A, elements 64 are arranged in two rows and five columns).

Regarding claim 11, White discloses at least three columns and at least four rows of keys (Fig. 2C, element 206 has four columns and four rows).

Regarding claim 13, Olsen discloses at least 2 click buttons (Fig. 2A, element 28 has two buttons). White also discloses at least 2 click buttons (Fig. 2C, element 204).

Regarding claim 14, neither White nor Olsen discloses a scroll wheel. The Examiner takes Official Notice that scroll wheels are well known in the art of computer mice. At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a scroll wheel could be included with the computer mouse described by Olsen, White, and Fukuda to provide further input functions from the input device.

Regarding claims 15 and 16 Olsen discloses input ports connected to the input device and the input port could be wireless (Fig. 1, element 38; col. 4, lines 43-50).

Regarding claims 17 and 18, Olsen describes a power supply for the input device (Fig. 1, element "Power Supply"), but does not expressly disclose a rechargeable battery or a solar cell power source. The Examiner takes Official Notice that rechargeable batteries and solar power cells are well known in the art as power sources for portable or handheld devices. At the time of invention it would have been a matter of design choice for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a rechargeable batter or solar power cell as the power supply for the input device described by Olsen, White, and Fukuda.

Regarding claims 21 and 22, the limitations of these claims are subsets of the limitations found in claim 1. Therefore, the combination of White, Olsen, and Fukuda disclose all of the limitations of claims 21 and 22 using the rejection of claim 1.

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White in view of Olsen and in further view of Fukuda as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Tsubai (USPN: 6348878).

Regarding claim 2, as discussed above the combination of White, Olsen, and Fukuda disclose all of the limitations except, simultaneous enactment of a combination of keys.

Tsubai discloses a chording keyboard that generates alphanumeric data based on simultaneous presses of two keys at the same time (abstract).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of White, Olsen, and Fukuda with the teachings of Tsubai. The alphanumeric entry keyboard of White and Olsen could be modified to perform data entry when more than one key is pressed simultaneously based on the teachings of Tsubai. The motivation to include chording function with the keyboard would be to provide a keyboard with reduced size and usable by a single hand but providing a full range of alphanumeric functions (Tsubai; col. 1, lines 43-65; col. 2, lines 19-34). Thus it would have been obvious to make the keyboard of White and Olsen into a chording type keyboard described by Tsubai to increase the functionality of the keyboard while

maintaining the small size of the input device. Thus, the combination of White, Olsen, Fukuda and Tsubai disclose the input device described in claim 2.

Regarding claim 3, Tsubai discloses simultaneous activation of combinations of keys that are substantially adjacent keys and non-adjacent keys (Fig. 1, keys 16-19 are pressed at the same time as other keys to provide different alphanumeric functions, these keys are substantially adjacent to other keys vertically, horizontally, and diagonally and are substantially non-adjacent to other keys of the keyboard.

5. Claims 4-7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White in view of Olsen in further view of Fukuda as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Higginson (USPN: 6703963).

Regarding claim 4, as discussed above the combination of White, Olsen, and Fukuda disclose all of the limitations except, the keyboard providing phrases and command functions as part of the alphanumeric information. Olsen only discloses characters and number information as part of the alphanumeric information.

Higginson discloses a keyboard capable of operating in different modes, the modes include input of characters, numbers, punctuation symbols, words, phrases, and other functions (Figs. 1, 5a-e, and 6; col. 9, lines 3-22).

At the time of invention it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of White, Olsen, and Fukuda with the teachings of Higginson. The keyboard input system of White and Olsen could be modified to include a the ability to produce phrases, words, and other functions similar to the abilities of the keyboard of Higginson. The motivation

would be to provide a multifunctional input device with programmable inputs based on the mode of operation of the device (Higginson; col. 2, lines 33-45). Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of White, Olsen, Fukuda, and Higginson to produce a device with expanded functionality of the keyboard input as described in claim 4.

Regarding claim 5, Higginson discloses different operating modes for alphanumerical data entry and that enactment of keys in different modes produces a mode specific set of data (Figs. 5a-e; col. 7, line 43 - col. 8, line 21).

Regarding claim 6, Higginson discloses ways of indicating the specific operating mode based on displayed information on the input device (Figs. 5a-e; the displayed characters and highlighted information changes based on the operating mode).

Regarding claim 7, White discloses using a light emitting diode for indicating operating modes (Fig. 2C, element 216; col. 3, lines 59-67).

Regarding claim 12, Higginson discloses at least one user programmable key (Fig. 5D; col. 8, lines 22-32).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Revis (USPN: 6285354), Yeom et al. (USPN: 5943625), Duncan et al.(USPN: 5847695), and Miyashita (USPN: 7440770), disclose mouse input devices that also provide telephone communications.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEVEN HOLTON whose telephone number is (571)272-7903. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bipin Shalwala/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Steven E Holton/
Examiner, Art Unit 2629
June 15, 2011